6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

565 423 701

dependency of the land recipients upon the Czar, because the Czar could at any time withdraw the grant.

642 565 423

By means of the pomestie system of land tenure which prevailed in the second part of the sixteenth century the Muscovite rulers obtained both of their objectives: unlimited power and permanent war preparedness. Once the owners of the estates became dependent upon the Czar for the possession of their lands, any opposition on their part could be crushed easily, especially if the caste solidarity and the development of an *esprit de corps* among these people could be prevented. By the end of the seventeenth century the hereditary land tenure and the conditional land tenure were equalized. As a result all nobility became service nobility (*dvorianstro*), dependent upon the Czar for their lands. All therefore became *holopy*, the slaves of the supreme *gosudar* (master). Neither type of land holder could alienate his land either by sale, exchange, or any other process. The principle was that "He who owned land should serve the Czar."

178 642 565

Thus, by the end of the seventeenth century, by making the nobility economically dependent and having the support of the Church, the Muscovite Czars were enabled to eliminate all potential opposition to their rule and to perpetuate their despotic power. After the nobility was subdued and regimented, the other classes, including the clergy, followed suit. By the end of the seventeenth century the slaves and free land tenants were equalized and bound to the land and burghers were bound to their [486] *posads*. It was prohibited for any person to move from one town or borough to another without special permit. There could be a penalty of death for such flight or desertion.

By this time, therefore, all persons were bound to their status. A rigid caste system was established for the purpose of securing for the Czar permanent and controllable bodies of people whose function was either to pay cess or to render military and state service. The whole state was regimented and militarized for the [641] purpose of the Czar's aggrandizement, defense of the realm and military campaigns; each person had one duty only—to serve the Czar and the country. The whole society was geared to increase the revenues and the military might of the Czardom.

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

III

593 No less intense seems to have been the tension between father and son. The son in this family was placed in a difficult position in respect to the absolute power of his father, sanctioned by the Church, by the local authorities, by the landlord, and by the law of the state. According to the Church teachings and according to the popular opinion, the parent's blessing brought good fortune and the parent's curse life-long misery. There was also fear of disinheritance, banishment, and military conscription. But there was also a strong desire for freedom and independence from an arbitrary and brutal paternal authority.

Open rebellion against this authority was not expedient, nor advisable. Leaving home without the father's consent was practically impossible because all the authorities would support the father against the son. Without father's consent the police would [486] not issue a passport which was necessary for travelling within the country. There was also a strong emotional resistance against fighting back one's father because, according to the popular view of life, "The hands which beat the father shall never be able to earn anything." Besides, as long as the father was physically stronger the outcome of such a struggle did not look promising.

There was, however, also a tendency on the part of the son to attach himself to his father, and to identify himself with him. But since the father tended to be detached and stern and might even abuse his son, the son had difficulties in experiencing a close and warm relationship with father and to identify himself with him. And since the father was not always harsh but often good hearted, compassionate and kind, the deprivation of a friendly and intimate contact with the father was painfully felt as a rejection. The result was the development of ambivalent feelings of identification and rebellion, of love and hatred in father-son relations. "When I have a father, I feel like killing him; when I have none, I feel like buying one," was the people's saying.

A son's wounded pride and rebellion against a tyrannical and abusive father took on normally a silent and inner form, at least as long as the father remained physically stronger than his son. This inner form of revolt was sometimes manifested in a secret